



Pacific Electric ROW/West Santa Ana Branch Corridor
Alternatives Analysis
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2

Tuesday, July 13, 2010
 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

City of Buena Park
 Police Department – Community Room
 6640 Beach Boulevard
 Buena Park, CA 90622

Meeting Notes

Invitees	Organization
Philip Law	SCAG
Matt Gleason	SCAG
Nancy Michali	AECOM
Yara Jasso	AECOM
Katherine Padilla	Katherine Padilla & Associates
Ernesto Chaves	Metro
Marissa Espino	OCTA
Kelly Hart	OCTA
Linda Taira	Caltrans District 7
Kirk Schneider	Caltrans District 7
Romeo Estrada	Caltrans District 12
Marco Espirita	Los Angeles County Fire Department
Nick Duvally	Los Angeles County Fire Department
Paul Maselbas	Los Angeles County DPW
Noel Takahara	CPUC
Lupe C. Valdez	Union Pacific
Karen Heit	Gateway Cities Council of Governments
Jerry Wood	Gateway Cities Council of Governments
Michael Kodama	OLDA
Deborah Chankin	City of Bellflower
Hal Arbogast	City of Cerritos
Kamran Dadbeh	City of Cypress
Jessica Flores	City of Downey
Keith Jones	City of Garden Grove
Bill Pagett	City of Lakewood
Douglas Dumhart	City of La Palma
Jimmy Ewenike	City of Los Angeles
G. Daniel Ojeda	City of Lynwood
Elias Saikay	City of Lynwood

Christopher Cash	City of Paramount
Raul Godinez	City of Santa Ana
Alvie Betancourt	City of South Gate
Nick Guilliams	City of Stanton
Rafael Contreras	City of Vernon

Project Overview and Presentation

- P. Law presented the project purpose and committee purpose. He stated that the purpose of this meeting was to solicit input on the proposed Initial Set of Alternatives and the Initial Screening Criteria. He provided a summary of the comments received during the six community meetings.
- N. Michali followed with a presentation on the Conceptual Set of Alternatives, initial Purpose and Need findings, the Conceptual Alternative Screening Criteria, and the proposed Initial Set of Alternatives and Initial Screening Process. This included an overview of the transportation challenges and criteria that will form the basis for evaluation of the Initial Set of Alternatives.

Question and Answer Discussion

- Jerry Wood (GCCOG): Can there be a bit more clarification on the rail options and the compatible ROWs identified to provide the connection to Union Station? It is confusing when trying to understand where and how the connection will be made.
 - N. Michali responded: The proposed alignments identified to date are shown on the study area map. There are two connecting options which have been identified: one along the railroad right-of-way (ROW) that is currently owned by the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles. This ROW runs in a north-south direction and is located at the western end of the PE ROW. This possible connection runs north to connect into a railroad alignment that is owned by the Union Pacific Railroad, and is used for Union Pacific freight operations and Metrolink passenger services. The proposed ROW then turns north to operate along the eastern bank of the Los Angeles River (owned by Metrolink) and connects into Union Station. A second set of alternatives would use the ROW owned by the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles to run north, and then connect with inactive railroad ROWs running west to Alameda Street. The proposed alignment would then turn north to operate into Downtown Los Angeles. The viability of the identified modes sharing active railroad tracks will need to be evaluated.
- J. Wood: Would any of the proposed alignments be different as far as the selection criteria for the Initial Set of Alternatives?
 - N. Michali responded: At this point in the study process, we did not use the feasibility of connecting into Downtown Los Angeles as criteria for eliminating any of the proposed transportations alternatives, as we need more detailed information to make that decision. What we have found to date is that if the proposed alternatives share the ROW with freight train operations, we will have to accommodate their operational and physical envelope requirements, including freight rail and maintenance of way

equipment. In addition, any proposed vehicles will need to meet Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) crash compliance requirements.

- Kirk Schneider (Caltrans): There are also freight operations that turn from the San Pedro Subdivision ROW on to the Corridor (PE ROW) and operate into the City of Paramount.
 - N. Michali agreed that there are active rail operations serving Paramount Petroleum.
 - Ernesto Chaves (Metro): What speeds were used for the BRT alternative in your assessment?
 - N. Michali answered that the assumed average speed for the BRT option was 22 mph as provided in the description and characteristics of the transit options presented at the community meetings. Information on all of the alternatives is posted on the project website.
 - A question was asked: For the study, are you going to be evaluating all of the six alternatives? Are you going to look at at-grade operations as well as above- and below-grade service?
 - Nancy M. answered yes that the proposed Initial Set of Alternatives will be evaluated, and that the study will evaluate the implications of operating at at-grade, aerial and subway during the Initial Screening efforts.
 - Karen Heit (GCCOG): Is the Sprinter/DMU alternative crash compliant?
 - N. Michali answered that she is talking with the North County Transit District (NCTD) staff that designed and currently operates the Sprinter system. It is her understanding that Sprinter service does not share trackage with freight or commuter rail service.
 - K. Schneider (Caltrans) added that the Sprinter system operates under what is called “Temporal Separation” (operating during a different time period than freight rail service).
 - Deborah Chankin (City of Bellflower): When you talk about conceptual alternatives screening, are those the steps that will get us from the broad, open “anything that's possible” down to the six alternatives for the next stage?
 - N. Michali answered yes that is the intent. However, because the Metrolink Alternative is proposed to be screened out at this time, there will be only five alternatives moving forward into Initial Screening.
 - D. Chankin asked for clarification on the language of "no horizontal alignment identification." Is this in reference to the study areas located outside of the PE ROW? Are the north and south connections not identified horizontally?
 - N. Michali answered that at this point in the process all proposed horizontal alignments are shown as a single line, and that they will be more defined in later study phases. Other possible northern connections will be identified during Initial Screening. And that the proposed horizontal alignment, or lack of, is not a factor in eliminating an option. At this time, we are assuming the same end points for all the alternatives.
 - D. Chankin added: Effectively, in broad teams, the ROW is the alignment within the PE ROW Corridor, and we are talking the north and south connections as undefined for the conceptual screening state now?
 - N. Michali answered yes, and horizontal alignments will be identified during the Initial Screening phase.
-

- Jimmy Ewenike (City of Los Angeles): In response to the answers you gave to the first question, you identified two routes north into Union Station, I have two questions. First, what is the length of the alignment to Union Station? Secondly, I don't see the route that you mentioned on the map. So, that raises the question, when is the possible routing into Downtown Los Angeles being considered?
 - N. Michali responded that during the conceptual analysis phase, it is assumed that all the alternatives can make the connection north to Union Station and south to the Santa Ana Regional Transportation Center. During Initial Screening, we will define the viable northern and southern connections on the map, and identify the resulting challenges and benefits.
- D. Chankin commented that she worries that the TAC and Steering committees are not reviewing the detailed outline of the Purpose and Need statements before Metro and OCTA review.
 - Both P. Law and N. Michali stated that as participating agencies, and possibly implementing agencies, Metro and OCTA would review the Purpose and Need statements first. There will be plenty of time for the TAC and Steering committees to review the Purpose and Need document before it is made public.
- Kamran Dadbeh (City of Cypress): Is the No Build Alternative still included as an option?
 - N. Michali clarified that the No Build Alternative is included in the process and will be carried forward throughout the study. The presentation will be revised to include the No Build Alternative.
 - P. Law responded that there were mixed responses during the community meetings to the No Build Alternative. Many homeowners who live along the PE ROW were in attendance at the meetings, and some were concerned with the possible impacts from implementing a transportation improvement, while others saw the need for transit service along the corridor.
- K. Schneider: Is there a reason why you cannot have as one of the options to access Downtown Los Angeles, besides the two alignments you mentioned, using the Metro Blue Line? In other words, connect the proposed project to the Metro Green Line with riders transferring to the Metro Blue Line to reach Downtown? This analysis would identify the penalty for that transfer.
 - N. Michali responded that that option will be included as one of the alternatives to be evaluated.
 - P. Law stated that there is still a lot of additional analysis to be done and that we will present more detailed information after Initial Screening is completed.

Next Meeting

Purpose: Present Initial Screening results and initiate discussion on the identification of the Final Set of Alternatives

Proposed for: Tuesday, October 19, 2010, 1:30 PM

Location: Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, One Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, CA.

Upcoming Schedule of Study Efforts

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| ▪ Hold Advisory Committees | July |
| ▪ Initiate Initial Screening Efforts | Late July |
| ▪ Present Initial Screening Results to Advisory Committees | October |
| ▪ Present Initial Screening Results to Public | November |
| ▪ Concurrence on Final Set of Alternatives | January 2011 |
| ▪ Initiate Final Screening Efforts | January |